

**REMARKS**

**Specification**

The incorporation of U.S. Patent No. 5,956,487 (the '487 Patent) issued to Venkatraman et al. on September 21, 1999, and U.S. Patent No.6,170,007 (the '007 Patent) issued to Venkatraman et al. on January 2, 2001 in the specification were rejected as improper.

Applicant has amended the Specification herein to remove the incorporation by reference of the '487 and '007 Patents and instead cites them as examples in the art of embedded webservers. Applicant contends that no new matter has been added by this amendment. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner approve the amendment to the specification.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 11-13, 15-16, 19-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Schlonski et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0196451 A1). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Applicant reserves the right to swear behind the reference Schlonski et al., but submits that claims 11-13, 15-16, 19-22 are allowable for the following reasons.

Applicant respectfully maintains that Schlonski et al. discloses a system where a management program on a server or workstation scans the network for new printers via Simple Network Management Protocol (SNMP) and provides a user interface based on the server or workstation to copy the configuration from a template printer to a new printer on the network via access to the embedded webservers of the printers through the management program and its discovered list of printers. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that Schlonski et al. fails to teach or disclose an imaging device that communicates a configuration change from a first imaging device to at least one other imaging device utilizing a list of other imaging devices stored on the first imaging device. *See*, Schlonski et al., Abstract; Figures 2-5; Paragraph 0027, Page 3; Paragraph 0030, Page 3; Paragraph 0032, Page 3; and Paragraph 0035, Page 3. As such, Schlonski et al. fails to teach or disclose all elements of claims 11-13, 15-16, 19-22.

Applicant's claim 11 recites, in part, "communicating the configuration change from the first imaging device to at least one other imaging device from a list of other imaging

devices stored on the first imaging device.” As detailed above, Applicant submits that Schlonski et al. fails to teach or disclose such a method of configuring a plurality of imaging devices coupled to a network. As such, Schlonski et al. fails to teach or disclose all elements of independent claim 11.

Applicant’s claim 15 recites, in part, “configuring one or more other imaging devices in response to the configuration change of the first imaging device, wherein the one or more other imaging devices are selected from a list stored on the first imaging device.” As detailed above, Applicant submits that Schlonski et al. fails to teach or disclose such a method of operating a plurality of imaging devices. As such, Schlonski et al. fails to teach or disclose all elements of independent claim 15.

Applicant’s claim 21 recites, in part, “processing a configuration change on a first imaging device; referring to a list of other imaging devices stored in the first imaging device; and configuring at least one imaging device from the list in response to the configuration change of the first imaging device.” As detailed above, Applicant submits that Schlonski et al. fails to teach or disclose such a computer-usable medium and method. As such, Schlonski et al. fails to teach or disclose all elements of independent claim 21.

Applicant respectfully contends that claims 11, 15 and 21 as pending have been shown to be patentably distinct from the cited reference. As claims 12-13, 16, 19-20, and 22 depend from and further define claims 11, 15 and 21, respectively, they are also considered to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and allowance of claims 11-13, 15-16, 19-22.

*Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103*

Claims 1-4 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schlonski et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0196451 A1) in view of Carcerano et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,308,205 B1). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and submits that claims 1-4 and 8 are allowable for the following reasons.

Applicant respectfully maintains, as above, that Schlonski et al. discloses a system where a management program on a server or workstation scans the network for new printers via Simple Network Management Protocol (SNMP) and provides a user interface based on the server or workstation to copy the configuration from a template printer to a new printer on

the network via access to the embedded webservers of the printers through the management program and its discovered list of printers. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that Schlonski et al. fails to teach or suggest an imaging device that communicates a configuration change from a first imaging device to at least one other imaging device utilizing a list of other imaging devices stored on the first imaging device, and therefore fails to teach or suggest all elements of claim 1.

In addition, Applicant respectfully maintains that Carcerano et al. discloses a browser-based network management system that runs on a webserver that also automatically discovers network devices coupled to the network and maintains a configuration database on the server, allowing the administrator to configure devices on the network through the server via a browser. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that Carcerano et al. fails to teach or suggest an imaging device that communicates a configuration change from a first imaging device to at least one other imaging device utilizing a list of other imaging devices stored on the first imaging device. *See*, Carcerano et al., Abstract; Figures 5 and 8A; Column 1, line 53 to Column 2, line 61. Therefore combining the elements of Schlonski et al. with Carcerano et al. fails to teach or suggest all elements of claims 1-4 and 8.

Applicant's claim 1 recites, in part, "wherein the processor is adapted to store a list of other imaging devices on the computer-usable media; and wherein the processor is adapted to transmit the configuration through the embedded webserver addressed to at least one of the other imaging devices of the stored list." As detailed above, Applicant submits that Schlonski et al. and Carcerano et al. fail to teach or suggest such an imaging device, either alone or in combination. As such, Schlonski et al. and Carcerano et al. fail to teach or suggest all elements of independent claim 1.

Applicant respectfully contends that claim 1 as pending has been shown to be patentably distinct from the cited references, either alone or in combination. As claims 2-4 and 8 depend from and further define claim 1 they are also considered to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and allowance of claims 1-4 and 8.

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schlonski et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0196451 A1) in view of Carcerano et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,308,205 B1) and in further view of Mathieson (U.S. Publication No.

2002/0143915 A1). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and submits that claim 7 is allowable for the following reasons.

Applicant respectfully maintains, as stated above, that Schlonski et al. and Carcerano et al. fail to teach or suggest all elements of claim 1, from which claim 7 depends from. In addition, Applicant respectfully maintains that Mathieson discloses a print queue manager that allows a user or administrator to view and manage the jobs in multiple job queues at the same time. *See*, Mathieson, Abstract and Summary. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that combining the elements of Schlonski et al. and Carcerano et al. with Mathieson. fails to teach or suggest all elements of independent claim 1 and thus also fails to teach or suggest all elements of dependent claim 7, either alone or in combination.

Applicant respectfully contends that claim 1 as pending has been shown to be patentably distinct from the cited references, either alone or in combination. As claim 7 depends from and further defines claim 1 it is also considered to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and allowance of claim 7.

Claims 5-6 and 9-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schlonski et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0196451 A1) in view of Carcerano et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,308,205 B1) and in further view of Hawes (U.S. Patent No. 6,026,436). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and submits that claims 5-6 and 9-10 are allowable for the following reasons.

Applicant respectfully maintains, as stated above, that Schlonski et al. and Carcerano et al. fail to teach or suggest all elements of claim 1, from which claims 5-6 and 9-10 depend from. In addition, Applicant respectfully maintains that Hawes discloses a system where a configuration is copied from a template printer to a target printer via the users' web browser by accessing an embedded webserver of the template printer and receiving a configuration form to post to the address of the target printer. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that Hawes fails to teach or suggest an imaging device that communicates a configuration change from a first imaging device to at least one other imaging device utilizing a list of other imaging devices stored on the first imaging device. *See*, Hawes, Abstract and Summary; Figures 4 and 5; and Column 8, line 18 to Column 9, line 29. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that combining the elements of Schlonski et al. and Carcerano et al. with Hawes fails to teach or suggest all elements of independent claim 1, either alone or in

combination and thus also fails to teach or suggest all elements of claims 5-6 and 9-10 that depend from and further define independent claim 1.

Applicant respectfully contends that claim 1 as pending has been shown to be patentably distinct from the cited references, either alone or in combination. As claims 5-6 and 9-10 depend from and further define claim 1 they are also considered to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and allowance of claims 5-6 and 9-10.

Claims 17-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Schlonski et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0196451 A1) in view of Hawes (U.S. Patent No. 6,026,436). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and submits that claims 17-18 are allowable for the following reasons.

Applicant respectfully maintains, as stated above, that Schlonski et al. fails to teach or suggest all elements of claim 15, from which claims 17-18 depend from. In addition, as stated above, Applicant respectfully maintains that Hawes discloses a system where a configuration is copied from a template printer to a target printer via the users' web browser by accessing an embedded webserver of the template printer and receiving a configuration form to post to the address of the target printer. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that combining the elements of Schlonski et al. with Hawes fails to teach or suggest all elements of independent claim 15, either alone or in combination and thus also fails to teach or suggest all elements of claims 17-18 that depend from and further define independent claim 15.

Applicant respectfully contends that claim 15 as pending has been shown to be patentably distinct from the cited references, either alone or in combination. As claims 17-18 depend from and further define claim 15 they are also considered to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and allowance of claims 17-18.

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Schlonski et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0196451 A1) in view of Mixer, Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 6,693,722 B1). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and submits that claim 14 is allowable for the following reasons.

Applicant respectfully maintains, as stated above, that Schlonski et al. fails to teach or suggest all elements of claim 11, from which claim 14 depends from. In addition, Applicant

respectfully maintains that Mixer, Jr. discloses an automatic configuration update system to update printer configuration changes to the communicating device/network interface. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that Mixer, Jr. fails to teach or suggest an imaging device that communicates a configuration change from a first imaging device to at least one other imaging device utilizing a list of other imaging devices stored on the first imaging device. *See*, Mixer, Jr., Abstract; Figures 1 and 2; and Column 1, line 25 to Column 2, line 53. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that combining the elements of Schlonski et al. with Mixer, Jr. fails to teach or suggest all elements of independent claim 11, either alone or in combination and thus also fails to teach or suggest all elements of claim 14 that depends from and further define independent claim 11.

Applicant respectfully contends that claim 11 as pending has been shown to be patentably distinct from the cited references, either alone or in combination. As claim 14 depends from and further defines claim 11 it is also considered to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and allowance of claim 14.

### CONCLUSION

If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding this application, please contact the undersigned at (612) 312-2204.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

8/3/05



Andrew C. Walseth  
Reg. No. 43,234

Attorneys for Applicant  
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400